

To whom it may concern-

I urge you to strongly oppose HR 4026. I decide what I want to listen to, when I want to listen to it and where I want to listen. Not you. I pay for my XM radio service and am quite happy with it. If local broadcasters provided me with what I wanted, then I would have never switched to satellite radio. By passing HR 4026, you take that choice out of my hands and the hands of millions of listeners. I do a lot of driving for work and pleasure, almost 3,000 miles a month. I do not have time to wait 10 or 15 minutes for a local radio traffic broadcast that may or may not address the area where I am traveling. By the time the traffic "report" comes through and I've sifted through the commercials, I could have chosen an alternate route and saved time, gasoline and aggravation. Nor do I have the time when I travel to another city to find the radio stations that provide the best traffic coverage. I also enjoy checking in on other cities that I will be traveling to to see where common choke points are, so that I may avoid them. If you are to pass HR 4026, then you'd better have a plan for dealing with the traffic woes in all of these cities (Seattle being among the worst of them). Anything that can help commuters move around more efficiently should be embraced, not squashed by an ancient 800 pound gorilla. This is about consumer choice and the choice is being made clear: we want our XM radio. Innovation and creativity are leading the way and FM will need to change if they wish to keep up. This is a petty tactic and one which does not bear further consideration.

If satellite radio was free and being broadcast to everyone, I see where the problem would be with AM/FM stations. But this is not the case. As long as satellite radio remains a pay service, then they should be able to offer whatever programming choices they (and I) deem worth listening to.

Thank you for your time-

Micah D. Nehring, R.Psg.T.
Seattle, Washington